THE DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF A COMMUNITY PLANNING
SURVEY FOR MANHATTAN, KANSAS

by

JAMES JOSEPH McGRAW

B. A., Oklahoma State University, 1955
M. A., Kansas State University, 1961

———————————

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Department of Architecture and Allied Arts

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1963

Approved by:

[signature]
Major Professor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

The attitude survey described in this study is the end
result of a research project initiated by Alan M. Voorhees, a
private planning consultant located in Washington, D.C.   In
the summer of 1961 the writer was employed by Mr. Voorhees to
research and investigate into the possibility of designing a
survey device to measure to some degree the attitudes and
opinions of individual householders toward certain aspects of
their community and to see if we could relate this information
to the planning process.

When we embarked on this undertaking we were not sure of
exactly what we hoped to accomplish. We had only a vague
feeling of need. Mr. Voorhees is a professional city planner
with special training in traffic engineering and is currently
serving as a member of the Board of Governors of the American
Institute of Planners. My own academic background at the
time was primarily in the area of social science. I had just
recently begun graduate study in the field of Regional Plan-
ning. My academic orientation at first influenced me toward
a broad comprehensive attitude survey but after much discussion
Mr. Voorhees and myself decided on a more limited course of
action. We decided that this research instrument must be
basically directed toward concepts related to the planning
process. After much study into the literature available con-
cerning community attitude studies and through a process of

trial and error we developed the preliminary form of the sur-
vey device which we now have under discussion.

The re-orientation of the research rationale behind the
present study and the general thinking which we employed in
the Washington, D.C. project was chiefly motivated by many
informal conversations which the writter had with Dr. Murlin
R. Hodgell.

Professor Hodgell believed that more thought and con-
sideration should be given to the political factors involved
in the planning process and how the planner as a professional
"expert" could justify the use of the survey and still func-
tion effectively within the structural framework of local
government. This approach opened up a much larger area of
concern and now we had to take into account the possible dan-
gers which might accrue to the planner if he naively steped
into the local governing process, attempting to access peo-
ple's attitudes within a community without proper knowledge
of the political facts of life.

Therefore after obtaining permission from Mr. Voorhees
to utilize the survey and to further study its potential as
an effective research tool we began to give considerable at-
tention to the political considerations inherent in such a
research device. It became our belief that the honest assess-
ment of political factors is essential if the survey is to be
meaningful because without this conviction we neglect to re-
alize the pragmatic nature of the entire survey, and that is
from the resulting data we are able to make a decision and

decision making is the essential characteristic of the political process.

This has not been a purely hypothetical investigation. This survey, with slight modification, is presently being utilized by Mr. Voorhees in his private consulting work. Studies using this survey tool have already been completed in Fort Worth, Texas and Albany, New York. Therefore we are not discussing the potential of a theoretical research tool, but one that is presently being utilized in the planning profession and which the user believes has been extremely helpful in his work.

CHAPTER ONE

THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE MANHATTAN ATTITUDE SURVEY

Regional and city planning is a professional endeavor which, on a given project, may require the expertise and dedication of scores of specially trained personnel. Individuals enter the planning profession with training in the various academic disciplines, because concepts which underlie the theory of modern planning, are derived from both the physical and social sciences. The combined talents of these individual specialists are required in the formulation of a rational plan for a region or city's future growth and development. Their task is to investigate, analyze, and synthesize the varied ideas and concepts inherent in a program of research before a specified plan can be formulated and then finally be implemented.

This mission is difficult regardless of the professional competence of the persons involved in the planning process because the task itself is by necessity completely interwoven into the political situation of each and every area where a program of planning is undertaken. The political framework is much more than the stereotyped structure of governmental boards and commissions which readily come to mind when we think of local self-government. The many governmental organizational diagrams to be found in political science textbooks illustrate a local governmental body as a neat structural arrangement

where duties, responsibilities, and spans of control are
clearly defined. But most importantly they neglect to depict
the human relationships which are necessary for political
action.

From these structural arrangements we can observe the
ideal relationships and functions between the mayor and coun-
cil, or the city manager and council or that between any other
governmental elements involved in the official scheme of local
government, but we are not able to recognize or determine ac-
curately the real locus of power. Local government, like
other social institutions, is a complex mechanism of many
individuals and personalities which cannot be correctly de-
scribed or understood by a superficial examination of the
exterior elements or character of the institution. If we are
to intelligently understand local government we must begin to
acquaint ourselves with the process of decision making. It
is through this porcess that ideas and concepts are translated
into policy and action. The planner must familiarize himself
with the decision-making process because it is this process
which will determine whether his "plan" is carried to fulfill-
ment or whether it is to be filed away in some governmental
office, soon to be forgotten with other such reports which
were conceived without adequate knowledge of "politics".

Before we discuss the professional planner's relationship
with the process of political decision making we should first
bring into focus the planner's role within the framework of
local government. In this connection we are here interested

primarily with the planner who is actually employed in local
government rather than with private consultants or planners
who are affiliated with private groups such as the Chamber
of Commerce and who wish to exert influence on special prob-
lems associated with planning that are the concern of local
government.

In the minds of many people planning as a governmental
activity is viewed with suspicion and distrust and is not
considered a proper function of a democratic government.
Some of these people believe that the planning process is
really a method by which personal liberty and freedom are
eroded away and a kind of planned, regimented society is being
fostered on the populace.

This view is not entirely groundless or should it be
considered without merit, because the planning process without
the safeguards inherent in a democratic system could very well
lead to a controlled society. But in the majority of in-
stances individuals subscribing to this view do not fully un-
derstand the role of planning.

> Planning, properly conceived, serves only as an arm
> to these political representatives to aid them in gath-
> ering, evaluating, and interpreting essential data to
> serve as a basis for making important policy decisions.
> Under this concept, the planning function is compatible
> with the policy responsibilities of either a democratic
> or nondemocratic societies.[1]

If the role of a planner can exist and be performed in
both a democratic and nondemocratic society, what then is the

-----

1. Donald H. Webster, _Urban Planning and Municipal
Public Policy_ (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 8.

function of the planner in a democratic society? Democracy
is not easily defined, for the term itself can connote dif-
ferent things to different people. Democracy can be thought
of as a personal value system or guideline for one's social
life, or the term can imply a system of government. We are
concerned with democracy as it relates to a governmental
system, and in its simplest terms it is a concept of govern-
ment in which the ruling power of the state is vested in the
members of the community as a whole as distinguished from a
particular class or classes.[2]

In the modern theory of democracy we are concerned with
more than the mere rights of the majority, for this view does
not involve the substance of law and the processes of govern-
ment. Democracy, in the United States is concerned with the
ideas of individual liberty and equality before the law.
Democracy also implies that there is an opportunity of govern-
ment by public opinion, and that the minority has a right to
express its opinion. The accepted method by which major dif-
ferences of opinions between contending parties are resolved
in a democracy is through the process of voting. The proper
exercising of one's right to vote can provide a degree of
order and stability to a changing and evolving society. The
planner must realize that it is impossible for him to function
properly in a democratic society without becoming directly in-
volved with the people, either through individuals or groups,

2. _Ibid._, p. 9.

and that his ultimate responsibility is to the people. He--
and those who work with him--must also remember that to clear-
ly identify the will of the majority is not to eliminate re-
sponsibility for the welfare of the minority and that the
planner's total responsibility involves far more than mere
opinion sampling.

The formation of public policy is the result of some kind
of popular will. This popular will is to a varying extent
determined as a result of pressures. These pressures will
come from many conflicting sources and must be balanced off
against the values upheld by the community. Pressures are
often the self-centered expressions of the aims and aspira-
tions of these groups, and therefore these subjective demands
must be countered by the presumably more knowledgeable and
objective judgement of the professional planner. At this
stage of the planning process the planner introduces that
professional quality which is his greatest asset, objectivity.
For a planner to act otherwise would jeopardize his effective-
ness and eventually his role in the planning process would be
forfeited to the partisan goals of special interest groups.
He would no longer be capable of solving a problem on its own
merits but would instead have to succumb to pressure groups
who would quickly recognize his lack of impartiality.

The planner, much more than his professional colleague
in local government, the city manager, is directly involved
in the process of decision making. The most critical error
that a city manager can commit is to become emeshed in the

process of policy making, because by his very position he is removed from this function and is solely the administrative expert of the policy-making body, carrying out their decisions. The concept of the city manager form of government was devised in order to remove the administration of government from the arena of "politics". How realistic this approach is to the actual situation that presently exists at the local levels of governmental administration is debatable, but nonetheless this is the basic concept behind the formulation of the city manager form of government. The planner, on the other hand, is expected to develop programs and proposals for the local legislative body and he also has a responsibility to the people and to his profession to strive to implement these programs and proposals, once approved.

This last condition places the planner in a dilemma where he must create proposals for policy decisions because of his professional expertise, and then he must act impartially in seeing that these considerations are carried into action by means of appropriate legal and political procedures.

This set of circumstances places the planner in a peculiar personal relationship with other governmental officials. For while he is not a duly elected public official with the authority to create public policy he has, because of his professional abilities, become directly involved in both the process of policy making and in the execution of this policy. This situation has caused considerable confusion of the planner's actual role within the framework of local government and

because of this uncertainty the planner often finds himself
cast in the role of seemingly attempting to circumvent the
established organized order of local government. This is
particularly true in localities where the professional plan-
ning function is new.

The realities of this situation is that the planner is
usually simply carrying out his dual responsibilities to the
public and to the ethics of his profession. The alternative
would probably be a policy of drift and irresponsibility to
the local governmental body he serves. This is a serious
problem that has arisen out of the tremendous technological
advancements which have been made within the past five dec-
ades. No longer is it possible to have people elected to
local legislative bodies who possess the required knowledge
to deal effectively with the many and varied technical prob-
lems that constantly face our local communities. Where are
the precise limits of responsibility between the specially
trained professional and the popularly elected decision maker?
A government of experts would be untenable for it would have
a tendency to act independently of the popular will if it
believed that its recommendations and proposals were correct
irrespective of popular disent. Conversely a government of
elected officials without adequately trained personnel would
be disastrous and eventually would degenerate into a govern-
ment of chaos. The solution to this problem is not readily
apparent, but the fundamental basis for the solution is evi-
dent, and that is, all parties involved in this problem must
realize that their ultimate responsibility is to the people.

Those involved in the planning process at the local
level of government realize that they must perform their du-
ties within a legal framework of rules and regulations. Ac-
cording to the legal traditions of the United States, local
units of government are the creatures of the separate and
independent States, and authority to engage in the planning
process is to be found in State statutes, or in those powers
which have been granted to local communities under the gen-
eral concept of home rule.

A general authority for carrying out reasonable plans
for healthy community development is implied in the total
framework of local governmental organization. However, the
specific authority for establishing a program of community
planning and for regulations pertaining thereto is to be found
in the enabling legislation of the respective States. The
enabling statutes lay out the guidelines for the organiza-
tional structure of the planning agency, the powers and du-
ties of this agency, and the methods by which it can perform
its function. This basic law does not include the many other
regulations which exert their influence upon the planning
process, such as, zoning laws and subdivision regulations.
The enabling law is usually permissive and not mandatory,
therefore the local governmental units must initiate action
locally in order to create an organization to carry out the
planning function.

At the local level there are two basic schemes for the
organization of the planning agency, the planning commission

centered agency and the executive centered staff agency. Both
of these schemes of organization are subject to variations of
structure depending on the specific requirements of the dif-
ferent communities, but each scheme possesses its own pecul-
iar characteristics.

The first step in the creation of the planning commission
centered agency in the majority of communities possessing this
type of organizational structure is the establishment of an
unpaid citizens' planning commission with members appointed
by the executive for specified periods of time. When this
commission is appointed by the mayor it is usually subject to
the approval of the legislative council, and when the com-
mission is created under the city manager or commission form
of government this approval is almost mandatory. These plan-
ning commissions, regardless of the claim that in certain in-
stances they exist as a semi-autonomous agency, are subservient
to the elected policy makers, partly because it is through this
group of governmental officials that the planning agency must
rely for public funds, but more specifically because in most
instances the planning commission is only advisory to the e-
lected officials.

In the commission centered concept the professional plan-
ner and his staff are functionaries of the planning commission
and perform their primary duties in accordance with the dic-
tates of this commission. A serious obstacle to this type of
organizational scheme is that the planning commission does not
have the political fiat that a legislative council possess,

and subsequently it cannot act as indepentently as perhaps it should, nor can it openly go to the people to seek support without endangering its very existence. It is a citizens' commission but in a sense it is isolated from the citizenry and the individual commissioners cannot be removed from their positions by a direct vote of the people because of their status as appointed officials.

The position of the professional planner may be further confused in this arrangement in that, while he is primarily an advisor to the planning commission on matters of planning or policy proposals, he may also have planning administration responsibilities for which he is directly responsible to the executive and the decision of his employment or dismissal is likely to rest with the Mayor of City Manager rather than with the planning commission.

The executive centered staff agency is an organization scheme where the planning function is directly integrated into the administrative hierarchy of local government. The planner and his staff in this organization arrangement are placed within the executive department of the governmental machinery, and his primary role is to be the planning advisor to the chief executive. This structural arrangement may also cause conflict in the role of the planner, because as we have stated, the planner is concerned with both policy decision and policy execution.

At the present, due to the historical development of the planning process in the United States, the large majority of

planning agencies are created along the lines of the commis-
sion centered scheme, and this structure will probably be the
model that most planning organizations will follow in the
future, except for the larger metropolitan communities which
seem to favor the more centralized executive staff agency.

Decision making is common to every political system re-
gardless of its ideological base. In the more authoritian
and totalitarian states, political decisions are rendered by
a relatively small clique of individuals who exert almost ab-
solute power and have little cause to be concerned with the
public will. The democratic states however, have a much dif-
ferent character to their decision making because of the na-
ture of their more open society. A democratic society has
many forces and groups which are contending for positions of
power, and primarily due to our system of laws and regula-
tions this quest for power is more closely controlled. Under
a framework of democratic institutions a person or group has
a more difficult task in attempting to grasp power without
arousing the suspicion and organized opposition of other seg-
ments of the society. Public opinion, law, custom, and self
restraint are major factors which influence and help to cre-
ate a degree of stability in our democratic process of deci-
sion making.

The above-mentioned factors have created a situation
where many people believe that our particular system of deci-
sion making is free from any dangers which might dilute the
essential democratic character of this process. On the

contrary, it should be noted that despite the essential dif-
ferences between a democratic and totalitarian system of
decision making, the decision making process per se, operates
with relatively few people actually participating in the
activity of making decisions.

In attempting to gain an understanding of the entire
process, political scientists have in the past spent consider-
able time studying and analyzing institutions rather than men,
but recently this trend has been reversed, and now attention
is being focused on the social and psychological characteris-
tics of the individual political actors who perform within
these political institutions.

Due to this approach of analysis, the planner must now
begin to understand the individual personalities and motiva-
tions of the public officials with whom he is involved, and
expend less effort in attempting to fathom the maze of offi-
cial organizational diagrams. Decision makers are persons
acting and reacting because of motivating considerations that
influence their behavior and this in turn has a decided effect
on their judgements concerning policy.

The importance of realizing that the decisions made by
individuals are the result of the personality development of
these persons should not be underestimated, because an individ-
ual views things within a certain framework of references de-
pendent upon this personality development. One's parents,
friends, educational background, professional relationships,
economic status, church affiliation, fraternal memberships,

etc., all have an influence on how we view the world around us. In other words, we do not live and exist within a vacuum but are conditioned to some extent by our associations and previous experiences.

When we concern ourselves with frames of reference and personal attitudes we soon become cognizant of the importance of the dominant values and beliefs which prevail throughout our society. When we observe that rural congressmen vote consistently for agricultural legislation or that southern Senators filibuster against civil rights legislation we can readily note the dominant values and beliefs which have motivated the behavior pattern of these political decision makers.

These values and beliefs are usually fostered by organized pressure groups who actively engage in the practice of lobbying for their particular group goals. A recent example of this type of political pressure is the active resistance shown by the Catholic church towards the Kennedy administration's education bill. This legislation does not provide federal aid to parochial schools, therefore the hierarchy of the Catholic church has come out against this particular piece of legislation. Congressmen from areas with a high proportion of Catholic voters are suspicious of the political implications of this legislation and consequently the present education bill has been bottled up in the committee machinery of the House of Representatives. This type of political behavior is not unusual but, on the contrary, is common to almost all legislative bodies, national, state and local, and

this fact is only helpful to us if we realize that it exists.

Once we acknowledge that factors such as status, wealth, education, popularity, legitimacy, and legality are crucial in the development of one's personality we then are able to better understand the significance of the social backgrounds of the individual political decision makers. But a point of equal importance is that we can begin to note the sources of the dominant values and beliefs which are held by individual persons and organized groups and to recognize how they influence the political behavior pattern of our elected officials.

Democratic theory requires that these elected officials must be accountable to the electorate and responsive to the popular will. This is a basic premise of democracy and is essential if we are to expect our decision makers to fulfill their responsibilities to the democratic concept of government.

CHAPTER TWO

THE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ATTITUDE SURVEY

It was with the concept that public officials must be
responsive to the attitudes and opinions of the general pub-
lic that the possibility of developing a survey instrument
especially designed for use by planners was originally in-
vestigated. A knowledge of the attitudes and opinions of the
people would place the professional planner in a much more
advantageous position when dealing with the duly elected pub-
lic officials, because if the planner is able to demonstrate
with factual information that there is apparent popular sup-
port for particular aspects of his planning program greater
would be the possibility for approval of this part of the
program. If on the other hand the results of a survey would
indicate that there is considerable opposition to certain
sections of the planning program the professional planner
then could review the proposals or could possibly find ways
to embark on a campaign of public education in order to in-
still popular understanding of his program.

Another use of the survey technique, which is just as
essential as the political considerations mentioned above,
is the utilization of the survey in obtaining information
from the public which then can be analyzed by the planner and
used in the development of his planning programs. Community
problems and conditions which the planner may be completely

unaware of may become evident after a thorough survey of community attitudes and desires.

This survey technique is therefore an attempt to gain knowledge of the community and also a method by which the planner may be helped to surmount his many political obstacles because of his role in the structural arrangement of government.

This entire concept of a non-elected governmental official going directly to the people to seek knowledge which he can then bring to the attention of the elected officials is fraught with possible dangers that could conceivably corrupt the entire use of the survey. In a later chapter we shall discuss these possibilities in greater depth, but first we should consider the actual development of the survey instrument and the problems and difficulties encountered in this development.

Originally our survey device contained four principal sections: community attitudes, leisure-time characteristics, travel habits, and household information. Primarily due to the costs involved in conducting a survey with all four elements, and the problems encountered in obtaining the assistance necessary in actually canvassing a given locality it was decided that our resources would only permit us to utilize the community attitude and household characteristics sections of the survey. We believed that this abridgement of the original survey would not impair the final result of our study because we are interested in people's attitudes more than when or how they perform certain activities. This is not to

underestimate the importance of the leisure-time and travel sections of the survey, but a set of priorities had to be established due to our peculiar economic circumstances.

In our discussion of the development process of the survey we shall describe all four elements of the original survey, but in the analysis of the survey conducted in Manhattan, Kansas we will limit our comments to the community attitude and household characteristics sections.

A knowledge of the attitudes of people in relation to their environmental conditions is essential if the professional planner is to develop meaningful plans for community development. It would indicate a high degree of naivete on the part of any one to expect the average citizen to be familiar with the many varied technical problems which confront today's cities. Words and phrases such as site plan, master plan, capital improvement program, etc., important as they may be, have little or no meaning to the average citizen. The planner must take care, however, not to extend or interpret this lack of knowledge and apparent disinterest in the broad aspects of city planning as a lack of concern on the part of the people with regard to their environment. John Q. Citizen has a definite concern with his environment. True, it may not extend beyond his block, and rarely will it cover much more than his immediate neighborhood. But plans, technically competent as they may be, which fail to recognize these attitudes, both individually and in aggregate, will rarely come to fruition.

Much has been written describing the need for more social
science research into this area, but in reality little has
been done to actually construct a survey device expressly de-
signed for the field regional and city planning. There are
few guideposts available to the planner who wishes to embark
on such a research project. At present most of the work is
based on trial and error procedures. But it is hoped that if
enough interest is aroused and a degree of cross-fertilization
of ideas develops among those attempting to create a technique,
an effective instrument to determine the expectations and
preferences of the people will evolve.

The immediate and practical benefits to be derived from
the utilization of an attitude survey are of great importance.
Professor Stuart F. Chapin asserts that the attitude or public
opinion survey will enable the planner to develop an under-
standing of neighborhood "livability". Its use will increase
the ability of the planner to grasp the expectations and pref-
erences of people as they relate themselves to their physical
environment. He further believes that, with the aid of mod-
ern social science research, a greater insight into the more
pertinent questions affecting the broad aspects of land use
planning is possible.[3]

Some of these questions involve racial and ethnic seg-
regation or intermixing in housing. While these particular
issues are fraught with controversy, the planner still must

_____

3. F. Stuart Chapin, Jr., Urban Land Use Planning (New
York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 255.

have knowledge concerning these factors if he is to formulate
effective plans. Other questions deal with income and educa-
tional levels and their influence within residential areas.
These are just two of the questions involved with land use
planning. The list of questions to be answered is practically
endless.

Mel J. Ravitz, Staff Sociologist for the Detroit City
Planning Commission, calls attention to the very real need
for attitude surveys in neighborhood conservation programs:

> . . . the success of the conservation program is,
> in the final analysis, dependent on the attitudes of
> these residents towards their houses, their neighbor-
> hoods and their neighbors. If conservation of neigh-
> borhoods is to be successful, not only must there be
> physical improvements, private and public, but also
> changes in attitudes toward more satisfaction with the
> neighborhood must accompany these physical improvements.[4]

The necessity for knowing and understanding the needs
and wants of the people who inhabit such conservation neigh-
borhoods is indispensable if the program is to prove success-
ful. The introduction of physical improvements without prior
knowledge of the people's attitudes may lead to costly im-
provements which are in direct contradiction to the desires
and wishes of the residents. This lack of knowledge could
perhaps create unnecessary antagonisms within these improve-
ment districts, and lead to the complete failure of the
program.

---

4. Mel J. Ravitz, "Use of the Attitude Survey in Neigh-
borhood Planning," <u>Journal of the American Institute of Plan-
ners</u>, XXIII, 1957, p. 180.

Another important use of the attitude survey is that it can indicate to the planner people's attitudes of satisfaction or dissatisfaction toward numerous environmental features which presently exist within a given community. A rating device can be employed to gauge public opinion concerning housing, parks, public transportation, shopping facilities, and many other facilities.

At this point it is important to note a statement of Professor Ravitz concerning the application of attitude surveys:

> Attitude surveys at best, can tell us only what people think they want within existing alternatives; they have not been used to explore what people might prefer, given other alternatives and changed circumstances.[5]

It is significant for planners to realize this limitation involving the utilization of attitude surveys; otherwise, considerable time and money can be expended without obtaining the desired results.

The initial phase of our research was devoted largely to the uncovering of existing survey material related to planning. As already noted, there is a scarcity of such material, but fortunately there exists the results of certain pioneering efforts. One of the original studies into this field of investigation was the pilot project developed by Princeton University's Bureau of Urban Research.[6] A more recent study which proved to be extremely helpful was that undertaken by

---

5. Ibid., p. 182.
6. Bureau of Urban Research, Urban Planning and Public Opinion: A Pilot Study, (Princeton: Princeton University, 1942).

Wayne University under the direction of Arthur Kornhauser.[7]
This study attempts to assess the attitudes of the people of
Detroit toward their city. Also to be mentioned is the monu-
mental undertaking known as the Penn-Jersey Transportation
Study. This massive collection of data obtained through the
use of the household interview technique, contains consider-
able information on housing and neighborhood satisfaction
which aided us in our own research and was of great value in
the development of our own survey device.

From the beginning, we were attempting to integrate into
one simple, comprehensive survey instrument a procedure by
which we would be able to gain knowledge concerning a person's
community attitudes, leisure time behavioral patterns, and
overall travel characteristics. This technique would enable
an examination of the relationships which exist between the
various aspects of urban living. For example, do people with
similar leisure-time patterns possess similar travel habits,
or will community attitudes affect travel habits? What in-
fluence will leisure-time behavior have on people's commun-
ity attitudes? Answers to questions such as these will shed
light on the ideas people have concerning their community and
the activities which they pursue in this community. They will
provide the planner with a greater insight into the complex
interrelation which in aggregate are cities.

---

7. Arthur Kornhauser, <u>Attitudes of Detroit People Toward
Detroit</u>, (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1952).

This type of survey device was also desired from a standpoint of operational efficiency. Merely establishing contact with a respondent represents a major portion of the costs associated with any type of interview survey. In addition, much of the data collected by one type of survey can adequately be utilized in analyzing the results of other surveys as well. This is particularly true of data concerning personal and household characteristics. Therefore, it was felt that this approach would maximize the planners's store of pertinent information at a minimum of time and effort.

It should be stated that our efforts were directed toward developing a procedure which could readily be used in communities with a population size of between 50,000 and 100,000. The limited financial resources and planning staffs associated with communities of this size made it imperative to carefully select and limit the survey to questions of major importance.

In its completed form the survey consists of four distinct sections:

        1.   Community Attitudes

        2.   Leisure-time Activities

        3.   Travel Characteristics

        4.   Household Characteristics

If particular conditions warrant, such as the conditions which were discussed earlier concerning the Manhattan survey, the complete survey can be broken down into its component parts and conducted on an separate basis.

The community attitude section consists of four essential
elements: housing satisfaction, neighborhood satisfaction,
community-wide satisfaction, and a listing of priorities for
future community objectives. Included within this attitude
section is a series of questions relating to longevity of res-
idence, the desirability of changing one's residence, and the
future prospect of home ownership. In addition, questions
have been added concerning home and park design, tax increases,
general awareness of planning, and other factors. The main
body of the survey as developed utilizes a rating system.
The person being interviewed is given a list of salient fea-
tures relating to his home, neighborhood and city. The inter-
viewer asks the respondent to rate these features according to
a schedule of Good-Fair-Poor. This procedure is supplemented
with a series of open-end questions. For example, "What
feature of your present place of residence (neighborhood or
city) do you like (dislike) the most? The respondent can
answer these questions freely in his own words. The answers
to these questions, when viewed in connection with the entire
community survey, will help to ascertain degrees of
satisfaction.

The leisure-time section is so constructed that it falls
into two well defined parts. The first part is confined to
the determination of what leisure-time activities people par-
ticipate in, and the day and hour that they engage in these
activities. The second part attempts to determine the scope
of leisure-time patterns as they relate to friendship.

Questions are asked to determine the location of friend-
involved activities (within or outside the immediate neigh-
borhood). The final aspect of the survey seeks to learn if
the friend or friends involved in a particular activity pos-
sess similar socio-economic characteristics in common with
the person being interviewed.

The travel characteristics section is a revised, limited
version of the standard internal trip report developed by the
U. S. Bureau of Public Roads. The revision was first made and
utilized by the Connecticut Highway Department. Additional
minor modifications have been made to conform with the re-
mainder of the survey as we have developed the instrument.
The information obtained includes the origin, destination,
land use, purpose, time and mode of trips taken by the persons
in the interviewed household.

The household characteristics section is designed in
order to obtain the following information for each person re-
siding in the interviewed household: sex, age, education,
employment status, occupation, industry, driving status, and
income. The following household data is also obtained: to-
tal persons, number employed, family income, race, home owner-
ship, dwelling unit structure, and number of cars owned.

Pre-test

A pre-test of the survey was carried out in the Washing-
ton, D.C. area during the summer of 1961 in order to develop

and assess the effectiveness of the survey. As it developed,
the pre-test phase involved two stages. The first stage was
limited to the testing of our original questionaire. This
survey device employed open-end questions and a rating sched-
ule which we were attempting to develop. These testing tech-
niques were later incorporated into our final survey, but with
a considerable degree of refinement. We were able to develop
a more logical sequence of questioning and strengthen the
section relating to housing and neighborhood satisfaction.
The final survey also contained a section concerning public
service facilities and their location.

In the initial testing stage, three Washington, D.C.
neighborhoods were canvassed. Within these three areas a to-
tal of 21 persons were interviewed. Included in this group
were 12 caucasians and 9 negroes. They were primarily of
the lower-middle or lower income groups and had an average
family income of $3,320.

In the second stage of the pre-test phase, we concentrated
our canvass in the area directly south of Walter Reed Hospital
between 14th and 16th Streets. We now attempted to test the
complete survey booklet: community attitude, leisure-time,
travel, and household sections. We interviewed ten individuals
from ten different households. It was found that it took
approximately thirty minutes per person to conduct the complete
survey. It was also noted that, due to the refinement of the
original survey, it was much easier to follow the presently
constructed survey device; consequently, the actual interviewing

went much more smoothly than in the earlier attempt. The community attitude and leisure-time sections presented little difficulty in actual operation and the interviewer had little more to do than to check the appropriate spaces. Little actual writing was required except for the travel survey where detailed information concerning trip origins and destinations was desired.

While the primary purpose of this pre-test phase was to test and improve the procedural aspects of the survey, an analysis of the substantive material was undertaken for the purpose of determining what types of information and conclusion might be drawn from the survey. In no way is it implied that the following attitudes are representative of the residents of the Washington, D.C. area. However, we feel it is worthwhile to make known the more prominent observations which we noted from the pre-test sample.

The major reason for selecting a place of residence tended to follow income levels. The persons with the lowest income level listed "financial" as the prime consideration for their choice, whereas, those in a higher-income bracket most often stated that they "liked the looks of the area" or "liked the looks of the area" or "liked the house" as reasons for their selection.

Upon studying the attitudes of people concerning their immediate neighborhood, we found that the attribute most often ascribed to the area was that it was "nice" or that is (the neighborhood) was "close to shopping or transportation

facilities". On the other hand, if people were questioned concerning neighborhood features which they disliked the most, they ranked dirt and congestion high on the list. In reference to this question, it was found that residents of the middle income areas were hesitant to answer this question. The reason for this hesitancy may lie in the fact that people may not desire to admit that they would select a place of residence which possesses defects.

One very evident observation which was culled from the second pre-test stage was the lack of park and library facilities in the area interviewed. We had added to the complete survey a section concerning service facility satisfaction and the facility's relative location to a person's home. The people interviewed, almost without exception, voiced strong disapproval over the lack of adequate park and library facilities.

In the two surveys tested a series of questions were exactly alike. Following are the conclusions drawn from the answers given in both of the surveys. The vast majority of people prefer to have homes designed for privacy rather than to encourage neighborliness. They would like to see communities designed with a mixture of architectural styles. They would rather have smaller neighborhood parks instead of one large, well-equipped community facility. In addition, they favor an increase in taxes if the money is to be used for neighborhood and community improvements.

Another similar feature of the surveys was the section on community objectives. People wanted the blighted areas brought under repair and the future construction of low-cost housing. If they wanted to gain information or seek guidance concerning these objectives, they would contact the Chamber of Commerce or their church minister.

When people were asked questions concerning the Central Business District or their attitudes toward features relating to the community in general, they seldom possessed a clear-cut like or dislike. The rating device used in this section rarely indicated a very good or very poor rating. It appeared that people were content to maintain a middle-of-the-road course on the rating of features which were not expressly within their immediate neighborhood. Downtown parking, transportation service, and street layout would occasionally rate a "very poor", but in the majority of instances it seemed that the average citizen had difficulty in relating himself to the community at large. People--at least those who were here tested--tend to concern themselves with their home and immediate neighborhood. This is their vista and they find little difficulty in identifying themselves with this area. With respect to this latter finding, it should be noted that the Washington, D.C. area is much larger than the city size for which this survey was designed. This lack of concern for the central area will hopefully be less prevalent in cities of 100,000 population or smaller.

An important observation which we believe merits examination is the attitude of people concerning dirt, congestion, sidewalk or street repair. Because of their narrow neighborhood view, people hold these maintenance considerations to be vital. Perhaps a great deal of the planner's work could be facilitated by concentrating more attention on neighborhood maintenance.

A large majority of the people interviewed were particularly conscious of the race factor. This became apparent even though no question was designed specifically to investigate this attitude. These expressions concerning race were most often to be found in the section dealing with housing satisfaction. It appears that the people interviewed were fearful that an influx of Negroes would affect their living standards.

In the District of Columbia a twist was added to this intense feeling toward race. Colored people, who possessed a position high up on the income and occupational ladder, were critical of other Negroes who were moving into their neighborhood. It was felt by these people that some of the newcomers would not be able to maintain the status quo. The more or less established Negroes were fearful that their less endowed brethren would move into the area and create an undesirable atmosphere.

The leisure-time activity of people, as determined by the survey, indicated that television was the dominant recreational factor in their free time. The radio was played constantly by

the housewives, and to a large extent, little interaction among friends living outside the immediate neighborhood was apparent. Caution must be exercised in weighing these generalization, for, of the people interviewed, the vast majority were housewives who, unless they have their own means of transportation, are limited in their movements. Also, the days chosen to test this aspect of the survey happened to be mid-week days. Any meaningful conclusions must wait until a more extensive interview is undertaken covering both weekdays and weekends. It can be noted that, when leisure-time activities involving travel were undertaken, this information showed up on the travel survey. This in some measure offers a more detailed account of the social-recreational trips.

As previously stated, this pre-test was not undertaken to obtain substantive material; rather, we were primarily interested in gaining information pertinent to the procedural aspects of survey development. We wanted to know if the survey as constructed would hold up in a field test.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RESULTS OF THE MANHATTAN ATTITUDE SURVEY

The developing and refining of the actual survey device
was completed in Washington, D.C. during the summer of 1961.
Then it was decided to select a Kansas community which could
serve as an ideal site in which the field survey could be
conducted. This decision was the most difficult procedural
problem that we encountered throughout the entire project.
From the beginning we were confronted by the realities of
economics, because if the survey was to be conducted it had
to be done on a voluntary basis for there were no financial
resources available for the project.

When we finally were able to interest the Hutchinson,
Kansas Chamber of Commerce in the undertaking we believed that
many of our initial doubts concerning the lack of financial
assistance were unfounded, but soon it became apparent that
the shortage of research funds was to be critical to the
eventual success or failure of the project. Ray Faubian, sec-
retary of the Hutchinson, Chamber of Commerce, was extremely
helpful and provided much assistance in generating local
enthusiasm for the study. We were able through his coopera-
tion to obtain the services of a Women's Civic Organization.
This group promised to take on the responsibility of conduct-
ing the actual survey without financial renumeration.

These women originally displayed considerable interest
and devotion to the project, but soon this interest began to
wane and finally the survey of Hutchinson had to be cancelled.
In review of the Hutchinson study we can state that these
people were sincere and attempted to give to the project as
much of their free time as possible, but still they lacked
the necessary motivation to keep the research project alive.
If research studies, such as the one developed for Hutchinson,
Kansas, are to succeed the individuals or groups carrying out
the actual field interviews must be given financial payment
for their efforts or they must be academically interested
enough in the final results of the project to denote their
full attention to its completion. Neither of these two condi-
tions were present in the Hutchinson undertaking and conse-
quently the field survey failed. This observation is noted
here not as a criticism of the lack of local support in
Hutchinson, but as a word of caution to others who may be
interestediin research studies such as the one outlined for
Hutchinson.

Therefore it was with considerable trepidation that we
selected Manhattan, Kansas as the alternate location for the
carrying out of our field test. We still were faced with
the serious problem of not having any research funds available
for the study, but we did possess an untapped resource in the
undergraduate students enrolled in courses related to city
planning. Donald K. Strohmeyer of the Department of Archi-
tecture and Allied Arts at Kansas State University was chiefly

responsible for stimulating interest in the project among his
undergraduate students. Through his efforts we were able to
obtain fifteen students who volunteered their time to perform
the duties of field interviewers. This assistance enabled us
to canvass Manhattan, Kansas with a group of individuals who
were interested enough in the academic aspects of the project
that they performed their duties with a high degree of success.

This group of students contacted the heads of one hundred
and two households, which is 1.5 percent of the total 6,865
Manhattan households. The one hundred and two households
were selected on a random basis from the Manhattan telephone
directory. After this was accomplished a booklet consisting
of instructions, addresses, and interviews were given to each
individual student. When the student interviewers had com-
pleted their assigned tasks the data from the completed
interviews was placed on data processing cards. Dr. Stanley
Wearden of the Kansas State Department of Statistics provided
the project with considerable professional advice on establish-
ing a program for processing the data received and by sug-
gesting a method by which the results could be illustrated in
the final report.

Before we begin to discuss the results obtained from the
Manhattan household survey we will give a brief description
of the community in which the survey was conducted. Manhattan
is located in Riley County and is in the northeastern portion
of the State of Kansas at the confluence of the Blue and Kaw
rivers. It is a community influenced by two major economic

forces, Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied
Science, and the Fort Riley Military Reservation.

Kansas State University has been claimed to be the first
established land grant school in the United States. It has
an enrollment of over 8,000 full time students and is well
known throughout the nation for its important contributions
to agriculture, engineering, veterinary medicine, home econom-
ics, and milling.

Fort Riley is a major United States Military Reservation
and is located eight miles southwest of Manhattan. This
installation is located on a site encompassing 53,000 acres
of land and was first established in 1852. The fort is the
home of the First Infantry Division and is classified by the
Department of Defense as a permanent army post. The permanent
nature of this installation contributes much to economy of
Manhattan, especially in the retail trade and house rental
markets.

Manhattan, with a population of 22,993, is the tenth
largest city in the state and Riley County, possessing a total
population of 41,914, is also ranked tenth according to popu-
lation size out of a total of 105 counties. Manhattan has a
trade area estimated at nearly 90,000 shoppers and is current-
ly experiencing a sustained residential growth particularly to
the northwest section of the city.

Another important feature of the general area which in
the future will be an important economic asset to Manhattan
is Tuttle Creek Dam. This facility is located six miles north

of Manhattan and has a capacity of 16,000 surface acres of
water at normal pool size. The dam was built by the Army
Corps of Engineers at a cost of approximately $85,000,000 and
will provide the community and the surrounding area with an
excellent facility for recreation, boating, fishing and other
outdoor pursuits.

Manhattan is a Kansas community with considerable poten-
tial for growth and is one of the few cities within the State
that has had a very favorable rate of growth. Since 1940 the
city's population has grown from 11,659 to its present size
of 22,993. This represents a growth of slightly less than 50
percent. Therefore, with the growth potential existing in the
community it is important to recognize the attitudes and pref-
erences of the residents and how they rate certain features of
Manhattan. Future development is going to take place in Man-
hattan and it is important to know what people now think of
their present community and perhaps this knowledge will aid
in creating a development plan that will receive wide accept-
ance by the general public.

We shall now discuss the results of the survey which was
conducted in Manhattan during November, 1962. A typical Man-
hattan respondent can be characterized as a male, forty-three
years of age with some college education, who presently is
paying a mortgage on a single family dwelling unit. This in-
dividual is most likely employed in a professional or service
related activity and has an annual income of $6,500. Polit-
ically our typical respondent favors the Republican party. It

would be unwise to generalize or to project our findings so as
to give the impression that these results are the attitudes
and preferences of the average Manhattan resident. Our income
level and educational attainment level are higher than that
reported for the average resident by the United States Census
Bureau. We still believe however, that the results of the
survey can be significant and important even while admitting
that our random selection from the Manhattan phone directory
gave us a sample which was orientated too much towards re-
spondents affiliated with the University.

According to Table 1 the Manhattan respondents rated
their present homes or apartments very well, and in fact had
little complaint concerning their present dwelling units.
Slightly more than 80 percent of those interviewed rated the
size of their house or apartment "good". This high rate of
satisfaction was also to be found when the respondents were
asked to rate the size of their front yards. Satisfaction
dropped slightly when the respondents were asked to rate
their backyards and sidelots, but still more than 70 percent
rated these features as "good".

Table 1. How do you rate your present house/apartment?

	Good Percent	Fair Percent	Poor Percent	N.R. Percent
Size of House/apartment	80.3	14.7	4.9	---
Size of Frontyard	80.3	11.7	6.8	.98
Size of Backyard	73.5	13.7	11.7	.98
Sidelot Distance	73.5	25.4	---	.98

When the respondents were questioned concerning their major reason for selecting their present house or apartment it was found that "cost" was the most important consideration followed next by the size of the house or apartment. Table 2 illustrates a major limitation to this question because it was discovered that over 28 percent of those questioned had reasons other than those listed for selecting their present dwelling. This indicates that perhaps this question should be expanded to include a wider variety of choices beyond simply the ones now listed.

Table 2. What was your major reason for selecting this house/apartment?

	Percent
Cost	28.4
Size of House/Apartment	14.7
Size of Yard	2.9
Appearance of Home	12.7
Only Place Available	10.7
Other	28.4
N.R.	1.9

In the open-end questions relating to what the respondents liked or disliked concerning their house or apartment we noted a great deal of indecision. This indecision was to be found whenever open-end questions were asked. The individual response of those interviewed resulted in most cases in a scatter-gun effect. The percentage were so low and the items listed so varied that it became difficult to

assess any value to these responses. We have decided that
these open-end questions were the most unsatisfactory elements
of the survey and that much improvement concerning their struc-
ture is required if they are to be of any merit in future use
of this survey.

We shall now move on to the section of the survey related
to Neighborhood satisfaction. The respondents, according to
Table 3, display a very high degree of satisfaction for their
immediate neighbors and for the Manhattan public schools, but
the enthusiasm of their satisfaction begins to decline when
they were asked to rate their neighborhood parks and play-
grounds, the conditions of neighborhood streets and sidewalks,
and the availability of residential parking facilities. Also
their degree of satisfaction toward neighborhood shopping
facilities and governmental services was much lower than their
attitude toward their neighbors and the public schools.
Table 3 illustrates that only in this latter category of
neighbors and public schools is there an overwhelming choice
of a "good" rating by the respondents, and that the selection
of "fair" and "poor" becomes more significant in the six
other categories rated. This would indicate that outside of
schools and their immediate neighbors, the respondents of
Manhattan have a potential for considerable dissatisfaction
concerning their neighborhoods. This type of information is
valuable to the planner because it permits him to become aware
of potential trouble areas before they break out into the open
and become involved in emotional neighborhood controversies.

Table 3.   How do you rate the following features of your
immediate neighborhood?

	Good Percent	Fair Percent	Poor Percent	N.R. Percent
Public Schools	81.3	6.8	1.9	9.8
Shopping Facilities	54.9	31.3	13.7	--
Parks and Playgrounds	48.03	21.5	22.5	7.8
Conditions of Streets/Sidewalks	45.09	24.5	30.3	--
Parking Facilities (Residential)	50.9	18.6	29.4	.98
Governmental Services	55.8	26.4	14.7	2.9
General Appearance	67.6	24.5	6.8	.98
Neighbors	87.2	9.8	.98	1.9

Table 4, dealing with the major reason for selecting a
place of residence in a particular neighborhood also indicates
the essential weakness of this type of question. As occurred
earlier in the question relating to the major reason why the
respondents selected their present house or apartment we
have again registered too high a percentage in the category
of "other". In this instance we have 39.2 percent of the
respondents stating "other" as the major reason for selecting
a house in this neighborhood. This completely overshadows
the 23.5 percent who state that "near job" is the most im-
portant reason for their selection. Again we conclude that
this type of question must be expanded to include more choices
if it is to be meaningful. Regardless of this shortcoming it
appears that nearness to employment and the general appearance

of the neighborhood are significant in determining the selection of one's neighborhood.

Table 4. What was the major reason for selecting a house in this neighborhood?

	Percent
Near Job	23.5
Good Transportation	2.9
Good Shopping	5.8
Good Schools	9.8
Nice Appearance	17.6
Near Friends-Family	.98
Other	39.2

The section of the study concerning city-wide satisfaction as it is related to certain specific community facilities offered an opportunity to rate over-all satisfaction to these factors and to compare this satisfaction with various age groups. First we calculated the degree of satisfaction from the entire group of respondents and then we obtained a breakdown of satisfaction of these respondents forty years of age and older. This comparison can be noted on Tables 5 and 6, we believe that this type of comparison provides us with significant information and will aid the planner in understanding the importance of the age factor as it relates to community attitudes.

The attitudes of the respondents toward the city are
important and we shall discuss in depth the replies the re-
spondents gave to this section. The information depicted
on Table 5 indicates that a high percentage of individuals
interviewed rate educational facilities "good". This high
percentage is maintained even when age is considered, and in
some instances, such as the community's educational facili-
ties and general appearance, the forty and above group reg-
ister a high percentage of "good" replies. This indicates to
some extent that the older group of respondents are quite
content with the present school system and general attrac-
tiveness of Manhattan. An area where considerable variation
is recorded is in entertainment facilities. The older age
group rated the entertainment facilities "good" at only a 62
percent rate whereas the community as a whole respondents
stated that these type of facilities are "good" at only a 48
percent rate. Perhaps, this demonstrates that Manhattan
lacks entertainment facilities which appeal to the younger
residents of the city. In a city which is economically based
on youth from the University and the Fort, this weakness would
perhaps be particularly significant. The general disparity
of rating between the two age groups can also be noted when
we consider the reaction of the respondents to general recrea-
tional facilities. The forty and above age group rate these
facilities fairly high while the entire group of respondents
are not inclined to be so impressed by these facilities.
There is considerable dissatisfaction in both groups with

housing, downtown parking, transportation service, and job
opportunities. These percentages of disatisfaction are rela-
tively similar across the board except in the area of hous-
ing. The older group rated housing "good" at a much higher
percentage than did the general group of respondents. This
perhaps illustrates the condition that housing for younger
people is not as desirable as that provided for older resi-
dents. The disatisfaction registered in the transportation
service, housing, downtown parking and job opportunities
categories clearly denotes areas which should be the concern
of responsible public officials. It would appear that local
citizens believe that poor housing and the lack of job op-
portunities are the most serious problems that Manhattan
presently must solve. These are not easy problems with ready
solutions, but now at least the planner can concern himself
with these problems before they become a general community
crisis.

The need for improvement of Manhattan's housing is again
apparent when we look at Table 6. This table sets down a
list of community problems and the respondents were asked to
rate one, two or three the order in which they would like to
see these problems solved. The creation of low cost housing
was ranked as the first choice by both the general group of
respondents and the forty and above age group. Solving the
parking problem was next in order of importance in both groups
with a much higher consideration given to this problem by the
older age group. The third selection was where the two groups

Table 5. How do you rate the following features of your city?

	Good		Fair		Poor		N.R.	
	G.G.*	A.G.**	G.G.*	A.G.**	G.G.*	A.G.**	G.G.*	A.G.**
Transportation Service	25.4	25.4	30.3	28.6	35.2	39.7	8.8	6.3
Highway Facilities	70.5	68.3	20.5	19.5	6.8	11.1	1.9	1.5
Housing	35.2	47.6	39.2	33.3	21.5	14.3	3.9	4.7
Downtown Parking	36.2	41.2	35.2	31.7	27.4	25.4	.98	1.5
General Recreational Facilities	56.8	63.3	29.4	25.4	10.7	4.7	2.9	1.5
General Appearance	77.4	82.6	22.5	17.4	--	--	--	--
City-wide Cultural Facilities	50.0	60.4	22.5	20.6	22.5	14.3	4.9	4.7
Downtown Shopping Facilities	50.0	52.4	36.2	36.5	12.7	9.5	.98	1.5
Educational Facilities	89.2	93.6	6.8	4.7	.98	--	2.9	1.5
Job Opportunities	22.5	26.9	40.1	41.2	27.4	23.8	9.8	7.9
Entertainment Facilities	48.03	62.0	25.4	20.6	23.5	14.3	2.9	3.1

*.G.--General Group: Includes all persons interviewed.
**A.G.--Age Group: Includes all respondents forty years of age and above.

differed and the difference is of some significance. The
general group favored the revitalization of the central busi-
ness district as the third most critical problem whereas the
forty and above age group considered the encouragement of a
county-city government as more important. The favorable
attitude of the older age group to county-city consolidation
is interesting and deserves much more careful study before
any definite conclusions can be made, but if this feeling is
accurate there seems to be much sentiment for this type of
intragovernmental cooperation. The political scientist could
further investigate this area and, if it proved to be justi-
fiable, conceive a scheme of governmental organization which
might prove acceptable to the residents of Manhattan and Riley
County.

Table 7 clearly illustrates the importance of the Man-
hattan Chamber of Commerce as a leadership unit within the
community. The Chamber of Commerce would be the source of
advice and guidance to 42 percent of the individuals inter-
viewed, and this is followed next by the public official
classification at 28 percent. This is important information
because a planner or any other public official must attempt
to get his message over to the general public and he has to
know what individuals and groups the people respect in regard
to guidance and advice. This does not mean that the planner
must make his recommendations in accordance with the general
beliefs of the chamber or any other similar group, but the

Table 6. Which of these problems do you think Manhattan should try to correct?

Problems	Priority					
	1st.		2nd.		3rd.	
	G.G.*	A.G.**	G.G.*	A.G.**	G.G.*	A.G.**
Creation Low Cost Housing	29.4	20.6	12.7	12.7	9.8	7.9
Renewal of Slums	8.8	11.1	13.7	12.9	3.9	3.1
Solving the Parking Problem	13.7	17.4	13.7	11.1	8.8	6.3
Improving Highway Facilities	4.9	4.7	5.9	9.5	4.9	4.7
Encourage Parks/Playgrounds	9.8	7.9	12.7	9.5	10.7	11.1
Revitalize CBD	12.7	9.5	10.7	4.7	9.8	7.9
Improve Governmental Services	4.9	4.7	6.8	9.5	8.8	11.1
Encourage County-City Government	7.8	14.3	3.8	12.5	8.8	7.9
No Response	6.8	9.5	14.7	17.4	34.3	39.7

*G.G.--General Group: Includes all persons interviewed.
**A.G.--Age Group: Includes all respondents forty years of age and above.

planner must not overlook and fail to realize the position
which certain groups have in a small community.

Table 7. If you were concerned with a problem in your town,
which of the following people would you go for
advice and guidance?

	Percent
Chamber of Commerce	42.1
Church Minister	6.8
Ward Leader	.98
Community Association	2.9
Public Official	28.4
Employer	1.9
Union Leader	--
Newspaper Editor	4.9
Friends	8.8
N.R.	3.9

The final table which appears in the main body of the
report deals with the respondents' level of satisfaction to
the location of certain community facilities. Table 8 is
devised so as to show the percentage of satisfaction to the
location of the facility in relation to the distance in blocks
that the facility is located from the respondent's place of
residence. This data indicates that satisfaction for all
facilities except Public Transportation and Playground facili-
ties are quite good up to ten blocks distance from the place

of residence. The reason for Public Transportation is that
Manhattan does not possess this type of facility except for a
one bus, privately operated system which has a rigid time
schedule and a limited route. The lack of properly located
playgrounds becomes apparent when we view the table, and this
condition of poor planning is noted by those who were
interviewed.

It is evident that satisfaction in relation to distance
would decline as the facility was located farther and farther
from the home site, but the actual break off point seems to
be beyond fifteen blocks for most facilities except the Senior
High School and playgrounds. The location a few years ago of
the Senior High School generated much interest in the com-
munity and it appears that to many the site selected was not
completely satisfactory.

Once a facility is located beyond fifteen blocks general
satisfaction begins to decline fairly rapidly. The one major
exception is the location of churches, and in this instance
individuals seem to be satisfied regarding the location of
this facility in all block categories except the 16-20 block
range where a decline occurs.

In summarizing the results of the eight tables which are
presented in the main body of the study, we can state that the
great majority of respondents interviewed are quite pleased
with their own house or apartment and are much influenced by
economics, general appearance and relative size when they
select their dwelling unit.

Table 8. Percent of respondents satisfied with location of facility.

Type of Facility	0-5*	6-10*	11-15*	16-20*	21-*
Church	92	93	94	61	80
Elementary School	100	81	--	--	--
Junior High School	100	100	94	41	11
Senior High School	100	91	66	50	13
Library	100	89	89	58	55
Playground	95	47	60	--	50
Park	96	82	75	33	20
Shopping Area	96	88	78	--	13
Public Transportation	72	30	--	--	--

*Number of blocks facility is from place of residence.

These respondents are very much satisfied with their immediate neighbors and have a high regard toward the Manhattan public school system. In general they are satisfied with the general appearance of their neighborhood, but when they rate neighborhood facilities such as shopping, parks and playgrounds, parking and street and sidewalk conditions their impressions are much less favorable. These respondents are highly concerned with the location of their place of employment in relation to the neighborhoods in which they reside and rate this condition first in importance as the major factor for selecting their present home. When the household heads were queried about city-wide features they again displayed a high degree of satisfaction toward educational and highway facilities and the

general appearance of Manhattan, but job opportunities, housing, transportation service and downtown parking were all rated much lower in relation to other community features. The general disatisfaction concerning housing was also reflected when it was noted that the respondents considered the creation of low cost housing as the community problem which Manhattan should attempt to solve first.

The influence and importance of organizations and institutions like the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce should not be underestimated, because the survey results show that this local group is a very important source of advice and guidance to those interviewed.

We can conclude that those interviewed are basically contented with the location of general community facilities such as churches, schools, library, etc., except in a few special instances like the location of parks and playgrounds and the absence of a well developed transportation system.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In the concluding section of this study we will emphasize three important aspects concerning this research project: the general nature of the survey, the major reason for its development, and some of the potential dangers in the utilization of this type of survey device.

This survey is not basically a statistical device created to measure a certain random quantity and then to extrapolate the results of this small measurement into a large general hypothesis. The survey instrument as envisioned here is a limited rating technique which the professional planner can utilize to obtain data concerning general and neighborhood attitudes and preferences through a small random sample of the community's residents. The survey was developed to be orientated toward the area of city planning and any discussion of results obtained from the use of this survey should not be made outside of this orientation.

We believe that by limiting the scope of the device and emphasizing the rating technique we are able to provide the professional planner with a research tool which he could employ to gather general information that would reflect the essential character and basic problem areas of a community.

The results of the survey would not be for dissemination to the general public. They are only for the use of the

professional planner and the Planning Commission. If by using
the research device he can gather the information which will
highlight real or potential problem areas, the planner then
should prepare a more detailed and thorough examination of
these problems before he arrives at any final conclusions or
recommendations. We therefore again would like to stress the
important fact that this survey is to be employed only as a
limited first step in the continual research and analysis
process and should never be utilized as the sole or even prime
basis for developing final plans, recommendations or proposals.

As we stated earlier in this report this survey technique
is a tool by which the planner can gain knowledge of the com-
munity for planning purposes and in addition to use this know-
ledge to better prepare himself for the many political ob-
stacles which he will encounter because of his peculiar role
in the structural arrangement of local government.

These two important considerations are the real and con-
crete reasons for the actual development of this survey device.
The obtaining of knowledge concerning a community is basic to
the planner's function, but the idea of expressly using this
knowledge in order to shore up and prepare his defenses to
overcome political obstacles is both novel and potentially
dangerous.

The danger lies in the fact that the planner is con-
sciously involved with "politics", and this could not be
otherwise if the planner wishes to achieve success in formula-
ting a series of planning programs for a community. In the

first section we devoted considerable space in developing a
rationale for the use of the survey as a safeguard against
political forces when conditions warranted this type of ac-
tion. Now we will discuss the dangers inherent in such an
undertaking and the possible reaction which might occur when
the planner embarks on such a course of action.

A planner taking the information which we derived from
the Manhattan project could make a tragic error if he at-
tempted to take these results to prove a hypothesis which is
not justified. The professional planner could not hope to
justify the introduction of new types of housing without
making a further study into the housing market. Questions
concerning the type of housing needed and the cost range
that would be required would have to be answered first and
to do otherwise would probably lead to disaster. This would
be expecting more from the survey than what was originally
planned and would completely overlook the "first step" ap-
proach which we have tried to emphasize.

Another and very important consideration is that the
survey should never be utilized as an overt weapon or club
over the heads of the locally elected public officials. This
research technique is not an instrument of coercion but should
be considered a device whereby the planner can gain pertinent
data and then by use of the gentle "art" of persuasion attempt
to convince the elected officials of the desirability of his
program. To conceive a research project expressly for the
purpose of forcing the local governing body to accept certain

proposals would surely end in a political upheaval and result
in the complete alienation of the planner with these local
officials. But such an approach would hardly be consistant
with the air of objectivity which is necessary in professional
planning in any event.

It is for this reason that we caution the planner not to
release the results to the general public. This is not be-
cause we fear or cannot trust the general citizenry, but be-
cause the information should be collected and analyzed in a
professional manner by the planner and his staff and is not
to be misued by organized groups to further their partisan
aims at the expense of the general public.

The results of the Manhattan study, if given out to the
general public, might leave the impression that the planner
and the local city government are encouraging the consolidation
of city-county government and this conclusion would not neces-
sarily have basis in truth. This idea received considerable
support by a number of our older citizens, but before any
general statements could be made concerning the "pros" and
"cons" of this type of governmental consolidation considerable
additional information is needed.

An additional danger that should not be neglected is that
when the planner makes his analysis of the data collected he
should not be influenced by outside considerations nor should
he be naive to the problems and conditions that exist in the
community. This survey is an initial approach to the con-
tinuing research process and, we believe, an ideal research

instrument for the newly appointed community planner. It is
hoped that the results from the survey would quickly outline
for this new appointee some of the more prominent problem
areas within a given community which need further investigation.
Therefore if a recently appointed planner utilizes the survey
he should be careful in his analysis of the data not to take
the advice and guidance of anyone who may have a particular
cause to advance or protect.

A final danger area which we should mention is that this
survey is in no way a substitute for the legalized form of
democratic action. The planner should not view the results
of the survey as a general mandate from the people and embark
on certain programs simply because these programs received
warm acceptance from those interviewed. To make general con-
clusions from this type of rating technique would only lead to
difficulties and the planner must be aware of the limitations
which we have noted when he analyzes the research data. We
register this high degree of caution only because we believe
the survey is valuable and can be an important research tool
when properly utilized, but if it were to be expanded beyond
the limits in which it was conceived the use of the survey
could actually create local problems that may prove to be in-
soluable and eventually lead to a general disatisfaction with
the aims and goals of community planning.

At this point in our conclusion we would like to state
that the survey, as it was conducted in Manhattan, Kansas could
have yielded much more significant data if the actual canvass

of the respondents and the summations of results could have been broken down into neighborhood areas or according to census tract as well as by age groups. These breakdowns would have provided us with more pertinent data which we then could have related to these particular sections of the community with far greater significance than shown in this study. Overall averages such as shown here can be highly deceptive. A "moderate dissatisfaction" on an issue may be the result of combining the satisfactions of one part of town with the critical disatisfactions of other neighborhoods. The economic, social and racial conditions that exist in Manhattan would have been registered more clearly by area break-downs and, in addition, we would be able to obtain deeper insight into how the neighborhood inhabitants relate themselves to these factors. Therefore, in the future we hope that others with more financial assistance than we were able to obtain will be able to introduce a more sophisticated approach to the conducting of the actual field test.

APPENDIX

Zone No. _____

APPENDIX I   Sample No. _____

COMMUNITY PLANNING SURVEY
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Administrative Record

Address: _____

Date: _____

Calls	Date	Time	
1.	_____	_____	Interviewer: _____
2.	_____	_____	Coded by: _____
3.	_____	_____	Checked: _____

Incompleted: _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

****

Hello, I am (Name)_____

I am helping the city conduct a community planning survey. I would like
to ask you some questions that will provide the city with valuable in-
formation, and enable it to make plans for future growth and development.

HOUSING SATISFACTION

Card No. 2   Zone No.   Sample No.   Person No.
Person Identification:
  (1) Head   (2) Wife   (3) Single Male   (4) Single Female
What were your major reasons for selecting a house in this neighborhood?
(LIST A)
      1. Near job   5. Nice appearance
      2. Good transportation   6. Near friends – family
      3. Good shopping   7. Other_____
      4. Good schools
What was your major reason for selecting this house/apt.?
      1. Cost   4. Appearance of house
      2. Size of house/apt.   5. Only place available
      3. Size of yard   6. Other: Specify_____

Is there any chance that you may decide to move within the next few years?
          (1) Yes   (2) No   (3) Don't know
    (If the answer is "Yes", ask the next three questions.)

    If you decided to move, in what area of the city would you rather live?
          Specify:_____

    Would you be interested in living in or near the downtown if the down-
    town area was renewed?
          (1) Yes   (2) No   (3) Don't know

    If you moved, would you:
        (1) Buy house (2) Rent house (3) Rent apt. (4) Purchase coop apt.
        (5) Don't know

How do you rate your present house/apt. with regard to the following features?

	Satis-factory	Too Small	Too Large
1. Size of house/apt.	___	___	___
2. Size of front yard	___	___	___
3. Size of back yard	___	___	___
4. Side lot distance between your house and house next door	___	___	___

How many bedrooms do you have in your house/apt.   ___

What feature of your house/apt. do you like the most?

_____

What feature of your house/apt. do you dislike the most?

_____

What would you do to improve Manhattan as a University Center.

_____

NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION

How do you rate the following features of your immediate neighborhood?

	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Public schools	___	___	___
2. Shopping facilities	___	___	___
3. Parks and playgrounds	___	___	___
4. Condition of streets and sidewalks	___	___	___
5. Parking facilities (residential)	___	___	___
6. Governmental services (garbage collection, street maintenance, etc.)	___	___	___
7. General appearance	___	___	___
8. Neighbors	___	___	___

What feature of your immediate neighborhood do you _like_ the most?

_____

What feature of your immediate neighborhood do you _dislike_ the most?

_____

In what ways do you believe your immediate neighborhood could be improved?

_____

Are you satisfied with the present location of your:

	Yes	No	Distance
1. Church	___	___	_____
2. Elementary schools	___	___	_____
3. Junior high schools	___	___	_____
4. High schools	___	___	_____
5. Library	___	___	_____
6. Playground	___	___	_____
7. Park	___	___	_____
8. Shopping area	___	___	_____
9. Public transportation	___	___	_____

Can you tell me the approximate distance in blocks from your residence to? (Go through list again.)

Would you like to see the development of more neighborhood parks which are scattered throughout a subdivision, or would you rather have a single large community facility with more space and equipment, but at a greater distance?

      (1) Neighborhood   (2) Community   (3) Don't know

If it were necessary to raise taxes to improve or renew your neighborhood, would you favor the increase?

      (1) Yes   (2) No   (3) Don't know

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE

How do you rate the following features of your city?

		Good	Fair	Poor
1.	Transportation service	___	___	___
2.	Highway facilities	___	___	___
3.	Housing	___	___	___
4.	Downtown parking	___	___	___
5.	General recreational facilities; such as parks, playgrounds, etc.	___	___	___
6.	General appearance	___	___	___
7.	City-wide cultural facilities; such as museums: concerts, etc.	___	___	___
8.	Downtown shopping facilities	___	___	___
9.	Educational facilities	___	___	___
10.	Job opportunities	___	___	___
11.	Entertainment facilities	___	___	___

What feature of the city do you like the most?

_____

What feature of the city do you dislike the most?

_____

What do you feel is the most important problem facing the city?

_____

Here is a list of problems facing many cities in our country. Which of these problems do you think (Name City) should try to correct? (LIST B)

Order of Priority

1. Creation of low cost housing _____
2. Renewal of slums _____
3. Solving of the parking problem _____
4. Improving highway facilities _____
5. Encouraging the development of parks and playgrounds _____
6. Revitalizing the downtown business district _____
7. Improving governmental services (schools, libraries, etc.) _____
8. Encourage County – City Government _____

Of these problems which do you think is the next important?

If you were very concerned with a problem in your town which of the following people would you go to for advice and guidance?

1. Chamber of Commerce
2. Church minister
3. Ward leader
4. Community Association
5. Public Official
6. Employer
7. Union leader
8. Newspaper editor
9. Friends

Where do you normally shop for major purchases: such as clothes, furniture and household goods: (1) Neighborhood____ (2) Community____ (3) City____ (4) Other____

DWELLING UNIT SUMMARY

Card No.   Zone No,   Sample No.

Type of Structure:
  (1) Single family   (3) 5 - 9 apts.   (5) rooming   (7) motel
  (2) 2 - 4 apts.   (4) 20 or more   (6) hotel   (8) institution

Personal Data:

Person Identification	Sex	Age	Employed Y - N Yrs.	Occupation	Industry	Yrs. School
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						

Total number of persons (excluding temporary visitors)   _____
Total persons employed   _____
Total cars owned   _____
Length of time at this address - (years)   _____

Last place of residence: (Specify)_____
(1) New family (2) Within neighborhood   (3) Within city (4) Outside city
(If 4) Why did you come to Manhattan?_____

****

Ask only after completing other section of the interview.

Do you own or rent your home? (1) Own   (2) Rent
What would you estimate to be the average value of homes on this
street?_____
Would you mind telling me in which of the categories on this card your
total family income would fall?
  (1) Under $3,000   (4) $7,000 - $10,000   (7) Refusal
  (2) $3,000 - $5,000   (5) $10,000 - $15,000
  (3) $5,000 - $7,000   (6) Over $15,000

Race: (Do not ask)   (1) White   (2) Negro   (3) Other

What is your political party affiliation?

        . (1) Democrat_____   (2) Republican_____

           (3) Independent_____

APPENDIX II

TRANSPORTATION STUDY
FORT WORTH, TEXAS

Administrative Record

Address: _____

Date: _____

Calls	Date	Time	
			Interviewer: _____
1.	_____	_____	Coded by: _____
2.	_____	_____	Checked by: _____
3.	_____	_____	

Incompleted: _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

****

Hello, I am (Name) _____.

I am helping the city conduct a community planning survey. I would like to ask

you some questions that will provide the city with valuable information, and

enable it to make plans for future growth and development.

Alan M. Voorhees and Associates, Inc.
and
Burgwin and Martin
Consulting Engineers

DWELLING UNIT SUMMARY

Card No. [1]   Municipality No. [ ][ ]   Zone No. [ ][ ][ ]   Sample No. [ ][ ][ ]

Person Identification of Respondent:
    (1) Head   (2) Wife   (3) Single Male   (4) Single Female   [ ]

Type of Structure:
    (1) Single family   (3) 5 - 9 apts.   (5) rooming   (7) trailer (9) motel [ ]
    (2) 2 - 4 apts.   (4) 20 or more   (6) institution   (8) hotel

Personal Data: [ ][ ][ ][ ]

	Person Identification	Sex	Age	Employed Y – N	Yrs.	Occupation	Industry	Schooling Completed*
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								

* 1. 8th grade   2. High School   3. Undergraduate   4. Graduate

Total number of persons (excluding temporary visitors) _____ [ ][ ]
Total persons employed _____ [ ]
Total cars owned by members of the family _____ [ ]
Length of time at this address - (years) _____ [ ][ ]

Last place of residence: (Specify)_____
    (1) New family (2) Within town or city (3) Within Region (4) Outside Region [ ]
    (If 4) Why did you come to this Municipality?_____

ASK ONLY AFTER COMPLETING OTHER SECTIONS OF THE INTERVIEW

Do you own or rent your home: (1) Own (2) Rent [ ]
What is the approximate age of this structure?_____
What would you estimate to be the average value of homes on this street?_____
Would you mind telling me in which of the categories on this card your total family
  income would fall? (If asked, say information is confidential.) [ ]
    (1) Under $3,000   (4) $7,000 - $10,000   (7) Refusal
    (2) $3,000 - $5,000   (5) $10,000 - $15,000
    (3) $5,000 - $7,000   (6) Over $15,000

Race: (Do not ask)   (1) White (2) Negro (3) Puerto Rican-Latin (4) Other [ ]

TRAVEL CHARACTERISTICS

d No. [6]   Zone No. [ ][ ][ ]   Sample No. [ ][ ][ ][ ]

Where did trip begin?	Where did trip end?	Land Use Code From	Land Use Code To	Trip Purpose Code	Start at Home (1) Yes (2) No	Departure Code Time Day	Travel Mode Code	No. in Car

Land Use Code	Trip Purpose Code	Day Code	Travel Mode Code
Residential	Home Based	1. Monday	1. Auto Driver
Industrial	01. Work	2. Tuesday	2. Auto Pass.
Personal Service	02. Related Business	3. Wednesday	3. Bus & Transit
Business Service	03. Personal Business	4. Thursday	4. Other
Institutional	04. Medical-Dental	5. Friday	5. Walk to Work
Recreational (parks,	05. Eat Meal	6. Saturday	
playgrounds, beaches)	06. Education	7. Sunday	
Commercial Amusements	07. Civic-Religious		
Retail	08. Shopping-convenience goods		
Other (Explain)	09. Shopping-shopping goods		
	10. Social		
	11. Recreational		
	12. Other (Explain)		
	13. Non Home Based		

TRAVEL CHARACTERISTICS

rd No. [6]   Zone No. [| |]   Sample No. [| | |]

Where did trip begin?	Where did trip end?	Land Use Code		Trip Purpose Code	Start at Home (1) Yes (2) No	Departure Code		Travel Mode Code	No. in Car
		From	To			Time	Day		

Land Use Code

Residential
Industrial
Personal Service
Business Service
Institutional
Recreational (parks, playgrounds, beaches)
Commercial Amusements
Retail
Other (Explain)

Trip Purpose Code

Home Based
01. Work
02. Related Business
03. Personal Business
04. Medical-Dental
05. Eat Meal
06. Education
07. Civic-Religious
08. Shopping-convenience goods
09. Shopping-shopping goods
10. Social
11. Recreational
12. Other (Explain)
13. Non Home Based

Day Code

1. Monday
2. Tuesday
3. Wednesday
4. Thursday
5. Friday
6. Saturday
7. Sunday

Travel Mode Code

1. Auto Driver
2. Auto Pass.
3. Bus & Transit
4. Other
5. Walk to Work

HOUSING SATISFACTION

Card No. [2]   Sample No. [ ][ ][ ][ ]

A) What were your major reasons for selecting a residence in this municipality? (LIST A)
   1. Near job   5. Nice appearance
   2. Good transportation   6. Near friends - family
   3. Good shopping   7. Other_____
   4. Good schools   [ ]

B) What was your major reason for selecting this hour/apt.?
   1. Cost   5. Appearance of house
   2. Size of house/apt.   6. Only place available
   3. Size of lot   7. Other: Specify_____
   4. Design of house   [ ]

C) Is there any chance that you may decide to move within the next few years?   [ ]
            (1) Yes   (2) No   (3) Don't know
   (If the answer is "Yes", ask the next two questions.)
   If you decided to move, in what municipality of the region would you rather live? [ ][ ]
   Specify:_____

   If you moved, would you?
      (1) Buy house   (3) Rent apt.   (5) Don't know   [ ]
      (2) Rent house   (4) Buy a trailer

D) Which three of the items listed on this card (LIST B) would you consider most
   important in selecting a new home?   [ ][ ][ ]
   1. Number of bedrooms   6. Convenient to recreation
   2. Size of lot   7. Close to work
   3. Location & quality of schools   8. Close to shopping area
   4. Traffic on streets   9. Close to friends
   5. Availability of public transportation

E) How do you rate your present house/apt. with regard to the following features?
                          Satisfactory   Too Small   Too Large
   1. Size of house/apt.   _____   _____   _____   [ ]
   2. Size of front yard   _____   _____   _____   [ ]
   3. Size of back yard   _____   _____   _____   [ ]
   4. Side lot distance   _____   _____   _____   [ ]

F) How many bedrooms do you have in your house/apt.?   _____   [ ]

G) How large is your lot? Width_____Depth_____Area_____ [ ][ ]

H) What feature of your house/apt. do you like the most?   [ ]
   _____

I) What feature of your house/apt. do you dislike the most?   [ ]
   _____

J) Is your residence connected to public sewer?   (1) Yes   (2) No   [ ]
   If no, have you had any trouble with your septic system? (1) Yes (2) No [ ]

K) Is your residence connected to a public water system? (1) Yes (2) No [ ]
   If "No", is your supply adequate?   (1) Yes   (2) No   [ ]

MUNICIPALITY SATISFACTION

Card No. ☐ 3   Sample No. ☐☐☐☐

How do you rate the following features of your municipality?

	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Public Schools	___	___	___
2. Shopping facilities	___	___	___
3. Parks and Playgrounds	___	___	___
4. Condition of streets and sidewalks	___	___	___
5. Public transportation service (buses, etc.)	___	___	___
6. Parking facilities (residential)	___	___	___
7. Governmental services	___	___	___
8. General appearance	___	___	___
9. Neighbors	___	___	___

If it were necessary to raise taxes to improve those features of your municipality which you rated "fair" or "Poor", would you favor the increase?

     (1) Yes   (2) No   (3) Don't know

What feature of your municipality do you like the most?
_____

What feature of your municipality do you dislike the most?
_____

In what ways do you believe your municipality could be improved?
_____

Are you satisfied with the present location of your:

	Yes	No	Distance (block)
1. Church	___	___	___
2. Elementary schools	___	___	___
3. Junior high schools	___	___	___
4. High schools	___	___	___
5. Library	___	___	___
6. Playground	___	___	___
7. Park	___	___	___
8. Shopping area	___	___	___
9. Public transportation	___	___	___

Can you tell me the approximate distance in blocks from your resident to: (Go through list again)

Would you like to see the development of more neighborhood parks which are scattered through-out a subdivision, or would you rather have a single large community facility with more space and equipment, but at a greater distance?

     (1) Neighborhood   (2) Municipality   (3) Region   (4) Don't know

If you were very concerned with a problem in your municipality, which of the following persons or organizations would you go to for advice and guidance?

1. Chamber of Commerce	6. Employer
2. Church	7. Union Leader
3. Ward leader	8. Newspaper editor
4. Community Association	9. Friends
5. Public Official	

REGIONAL ATTITUDE

Code No. [4]   Sample No. [| | |]

How do you rate the following features of the Region?

	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Transportation service			
2. Highway facilities			
3. Housing			
4. Downtown parking			
5. General recreational facilities; such as parks, playgrounds, etc.			
6. General appearance			
7. Region-wide cultural facilities; such as museums, concerts, etc.			
8. Downtown shopping facilities			
9. Educational facilities			
10. Job opportunities			
11. Entertainment facilities			
12. Suburban shopping facilities			

What feature of the Region do you like the most?_____

What feature of the Region do you dislike the most?_____

What do you feel is the most important problem facing the Region?
_____

Here is a list of problems (LIST C) being faced by many areas in the country. Which of these problems do you think apply to this Region?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
1. Insufficient & inadequate low-income housing			
2. Insufficient & inadequate middle-income housing			
3. Insufficient & inadequate housing for elderly			
4. Sub-standard housing			
5. Run-down neighborhoods			
6. Inadequate parking			
7. Inadequate streets & highways			
8. Insufficient parks and playgrounds			
9. Unsatisfactory downtown business district			
10. Inadequate public facilities (schools, libraries, etc.)			
11. Inadequate refuse collection & disposal			
12. Inadequate public water supply			
13. Inadequate sewage disposal facilities			
14. Inadequate job opportunities			

Which of these problems do you feel is most important?_____

Which of these problems do you feel is next in importance?_____

LEISURE TIME AND RECREATION SURVEY

Host No. [5]   Sample No. [ ][ ][ ][ ]   Day Activities Performed [ ]

Activity	AM					PM											
	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Television - radio																	
2. Reading - hobbies																	
3. Education																	
4. Home improvement																	
5. Entertaining at home																	
6. Visiting friends																	
7. Attending parties																	
8. Movies - Drive-Ins																	
9. Restaurant/Night Club																	
10. Shopping																	
11. Theater, Concert, Lecture																	
12. Indoor sports																	
13. Outdoor sports																	
14. Spectator - sports																	
15. Comm. service work																	
16. Citizen Association																	
17. Fraternal Organization																	
18. Church activities																	

			Leisure-Time Activities Undertaken With Friends						
Act. No.	Time (Hrs.)	Location Code*	Similar: (1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know						
			Income	Education	Age	Occup.	Politics	Religion

* Location Code: (1) Neighborhood   (2) Community   (3) City   (4) Other

What major recreational areas have you visited in the last month? _____ [ ]

Where did you spend your last summer vacation? (Specify) _____ [ ]

Would you please look at this list (LIST D) and tell me which of these items your family has?
  1. Fishing Equipment   5. Golf Clubs   9. Summer Cottage
  2. Badminton, Croquet, Horseshoe set 6. Outboard Motor 10. Skiis
  3. Portable Stove   7. Boat -Canoe   11. Ice Skates
  4. Backyard Picnic Facilities   8. Boat Trailer   12. Swimming Pool

Where did you last purchase
  1. Groceries and meats? _____
  2. Apparel (clothes or shoes)? _____
  3. Furniture? _____
  4. Major appliances? _____
  5. Variety store? _____
  6. Other Retail (sporting goods, glass, jewelry, etc.) _____

MANUAL OF INSTRUCTIONS

General

A neat appearance and courteous manner are all-important to a successful interviewer.
The ability to communicate with other people and to assist them in answering the ques-
tions is very necessary.

Following are several DON'TS:

    Don't chew gum.
    Don't smoke while making an interview.
    Don't invite yourself into the home. In most cases the person being interviewed
        will invite the interviewer in; however, it should never be suggested by the
        interviewer.
    Don't insist on an answer to a specific question if the person being interviewed
        is reluctant.
    Do not be insistent on making an interview at the time of the first contact. If
        it appears to be an inconvenient time to the person being interviewed, make
        an appointment for some later date.
    Don't obtain information from children. Interview only the adult members of
        a family.

Time of Interview

Interviews may be obtained during any day and at any time convenient to the person
being interviewed. It has been found that the most productive interviewing periods are
during weekday evenings before dark, on Saturdays between 9 A. M. and 6 P. M. , or
Sunday between 1 and 6 P. M. .

Where Interviews are Made

Each interview assigned to an interviewer will specify the address of the dwelling unit to
be interviewed. Occasionally, a description of the dwelling unit will be given in addition
to the address; for example, "above store" or "house in rear". In the case of apartment
buildings, the interview form will specify the apartment number.

If, for some reason, the interviewer cannot complete an interview at a specified address,
he should return the form to the supervisor stating the reasons, i. e. , "house vacant",
"occupant on vacation".

IN NO CASE SHOULD THE INTERVIEWER OBTAIN INFORMATION FROM AN ADDRESS
OTHER THAN THE ONE SPECIFIED ON THE INTERVIEW FORM.

Who is to be Interviewed:

Information should be obtained from only the adult members of the family. Do not obtain
information from children or roomers.

INTERVIEW FORM

IMPORTANT: DO NOT WRITE IN THE CODING BLOCKS ON ANY OF THE FORMS

Separate interview forms should be completed for each family or household found at each address designated for interview. Where two or more households are found at the sample address, each additional interview form should be designated by the same address, but with a suffix as A, B, or C, etc.

A household may be defined as a family, or any other group of persons, living together in the same living quarters and, in most cases, having private facilities available for cooking. The persons in a household are usually related by blood or marriage; however, domestic or other employees who sleep in an employer's house should be included with the family or household in which they are employed; and roomers occupying quarters in a private home should be included with the household in which they reside. Only one interview form need be completed for each such household. Two or more families occupying portions of a structure originally built as a one-family dwelling, but now separate and distinct, should be considered as different households and separate interview forms completed for each such household.

The attached interview form is divided into 7 sections:

1. Administrative Record
2. Dwelling Unit Summary
3. Housing Satisfaction
4. Municipality Satisfaction
5. Regional Attitudes
6. Leisure Time Recreation
7. Travel Characteristics

The interview form has been developed so that many entries are made by simply circling a number that refers to the appropriate answer; for the remaining inquiries it is necessary to record only a figure or a few words to complete the answer. This procedure reduces the work of the interviewers and automatically codes the data for punching on tabulating cards in preparation for subsequent analysis.

When the interview has been completed, and each inquiry is checked for accuracy and completeness, the interviewer shall fill in his portion of the Administrative Record and submit the completed form to the supervisor at the first opportunity. Work involved in checking the entries and filling in the Administrative Record should be done after the interviewer leaves the home where the interview was made.

<u>Detailed Instructions</u>

The inquiries are placed on the interview form in the most desirable order for conducting an interview; however, with a little practice, each interviewer will develop a certain technique in asking the questions which is best suited to the individual. In most cases the inquiries may be stated briefly, somewhat as phrased on the form, but there will be instances such as: reluctance to answer a question by the person being interviewed, an error indicative of a misunderstanding, or an illogical answer, when a few words or a brief explanation will be necessary to correct the answer or put the person at ease.

Only those items which require definitions or explanation are covered in the following discussion.

<u>Dwelling Unit Summary</u>

Type of structure: Circle appropriate number. This should be done prior to interview.

Person Identification of Respondent: Circle appropriate number.

Personal data: List all members of family including children, roomers and live-in servants. Names are unnecessary and undesirable. Enter short terms; such as, "head", "wife", "son", "roomer", "maid".

Sex and age: Do not ask; this may be determined by interviewer.

Employed: Simply enter "Y" for Yes and "N" for No. In column headed <u>Yrs</u> determine number of years employed in present job. Disregard part time employment of wives and children unless it is substantial, over 20 hours per week, and sustained.

Occupation and Industry: Make short statement which accurately describes the specific work done and the type of business within which he works; for example, stenographer - law office, mechanic - auto repair shop, teacher - high school.

School Completed: This information need only be obtained for the adult members of a family. Use the appropriate code on form.

1. 8th Grade
2. High School
3. College
4. Post Graduate

Total cars owned: Enter the total number of passenger cars owned by all residents of the household. Include station wagons and jeeps as passenger cars. Include vehicles not in operation because of needed repairs as well as those in operation, but exclude "junked" vehicles. Include those on which purchase payments are still being made. Do not include a passenger car owned by the employer of a member of the household, even though such vehicle is garaged on the premises. Do not include trucks or taxis in answer to this inquiry.

Last place of residence: If answer to this question falls into categories 1, 2, or 3, simply circle number. If, however, the respondent came from outside the study area, circle (4) and specify the town from which he came. In addition, ask why he came to this area and record response in space provided.

DO NOT ASK THE REMAINING QUESTIONS ON DWELLING UNIT SUMMARY UNTIL THE OTHER PORTIONS OF INTERVIEW ARE COMPLETED.

****

Housing Satisfaction, Municipality Satisfaction and Regional Attitudes

These portions of the survey are self-explanatory.

****

Leisure Time and Recreation

Indicate the day on which the activities occurred. This should be the day previous to the interview.

This section of the survey requires a brief introductory statement, such as the following:

"This next section of the Regional Planning Survey concerns your participation in certain leisure-time activites. Here is a list (LIST C) containing a number of such activities. I would like to know if yesterday you participated in any of the activities listed. If you have, could you state the time the participation occurred."

The interviwer should draw a line through the appropriate spaces or blocks to record the time and type of activities undertaken.

The second part of the leisure-time survey is completed by the interviewer. This section deals with leisure-time activities undertaken with friends. The interviewer asks the person being interviewed to indicate the leisure-time activities that were performed with friends. The interviewer notes the number corresponding to the activity and the time devoted to it. Then he registers this information in the spaces provided. He asks the respondent the location of the friend's home and records the appropriate code, (1) within neighborhood, (2) within municipality, (3) within region, (4) other. Finally, he asks the respondent if his friend or friends involved in the leisure-time activities are similar to him in matters of income, education, age, occupation, political affiliation and religious preference. A (1) for "Yes", (2) for "No" or (3) for "Don't know" is registered in the appropriate space provided.

The last questions are self-explanatory. Be sure to record the answers so that the exact locations of the activities are clear.

****

Travel Characteristics

The purpose of this report is to obtain information on all trips made by all members of the household (except those persons under five years of age) on the day previous to the interview, whether the trip was made as an auto driver or a passenger in an auto, streetcar, bus, truck, or taxi. EXCEPTION: WALK TRIPS TO AND FROM WORK WILL BE RECORDED. One horizontal line on the internal trip report form should be completed for each trip made by each member of the household 5 years of age or older.

The 24-hour period for which trip information is to be collected begins at 4 A. M. and extends until 4 A. M. the following day. For example, when interviewing on Saturday to obtain trip data for Friday, include all trips starting between the hours of 4 A. M. Friday and 4 A. M. Saturday. The travel day is defined in this manner so that it will begin and end at a time when travel is lightest.

In addition, only travel performed on weekdays is wanted. Therefore, if an interview is being made on Sunday or Monday obtain travel information pertaining to the previous Friday. Interviews being conducted on other days (Tuesday - Saturday) should obtain information concerning the previous day's travel.

A "trip" is defined as the one-way travel from one point to another for a particular purpose, such as one of the purposes listed at the bottom of the form. Thus, round trips, to and from work, to and from shopping, to and from the theatre, etc. represent at least two trips in each case; one for the travel to the place of work, shopping or theatre, and one for the return travel. A continuous round trip, such as a pleasure drive through the park, must also be considered as two trips; the most distant point reached during the drive being recorded as the end of the first trip and the beginning of the second.

In general, stops are regarded as the end of one trip and the beginning of another, unless the stops are made for relatively unimportant purposes which do not determine the route of travel, such as drop a letter in a mail box, buy a package of cigarettes, pick up a hitch-hiker, purchase gasoline, or buy light refreshments. Stops of this nature ordinarily do not control the route of travel and should be disregarded. Of course, stops made to avoid conflict with traffic or to comply with directions of traffic officers or traffic control signs and signals also should be disregarded.

Stops which direct the route of travel, such as transacting business at a bank, visiting a friend, eating a meal, shopping, picking up or discharging a passenger at some specific location should be considered the end of one trip and the beginning of another. In most cases, the person being interviewed will automatically give the proper location to be considered the end of a trip because of his desire to get to some specific location for some specific purpose, but it shall be the responsibility of the interviewer to see that proper information is obtained.

Certain occupations create travel of a circuitous nature involving several stops for a similar purpose, such as a doctor visiting his patients, a traveling salesman visiting his customers, or a real estate agent in the course of his work, and other similar occupations. Travel of this nature is important in a city, and to portray it clearly the travel between each stop should be recorded as a separate trip. It is realized that some occupations in this category such as door-to-door salesmen, public utilities meter readers, and certain deliverymen, who use passenger cars, may make a great many stops which are only a few houses apart but which would be classified as trips according to the above definition. Extremely short trips such as these are difficult to obtain accurately, laborious to record, and would not be significant in the subsequent tabulations to be prepared for the analysis. Hence, to avoid these unnecessary complications, only trips which are approximately two city blocks or greater in length need to be recorded. Disregard entirely any travel between stops which are less than two city blocks apart.

Travel by rail or bus from a railway terminal or bus station to an out-of-town point is not to be considered as a trip in this study. However, trips to the bus or railroad station within the city should be included. Also, trips made in an automobile to or from out-of-town points should be included.

Trips by truck, bus, and taxi <u>drivers</u> made while driving such vehicles in the course of their day's work, should not be reported on the Internal trip report form because information concerning such trips will be obtained by other means. However, trips made by passengers in such vehicles should be recorded. Also, trips made by the drivers in going to and from the point of starting their day's work should be recorded.

CAUTION: USE A SEPARATE LINE ON THE TRAVEL CHARACTERISTICS FORM FOR EACH ONE-WAY TRIP REPORTED.

Detailed Instructions: In presenting the detailed instructions for recording trip information, the following paragraphs have been prefixed with headings corresponding to those used in each vertical column near the top of the trip report form. When recording the interview data DO NOT WRITE IN THE CODING BLOCKS.

Person Number: Enter the number of the person making the trip which was previously assigned in filling out the Dwelling Unit Summary.

Where did trip begin? - Where did trip end?: Entries for these two inquiries are similar and will be described together in the following paragraphs. Complete and accurate information for both the origin and the destination of all trips is essential to the success of the study.

These inquiries refer to points where each person making a trip actually starts or ends the trip, such as a persons' home, an office, or a store, theater, bank, school, factory, etc., and do not refer to points to which a person must walk to board a streetcar or bus, or to where the automobile was parked. In other words, these inquiries refer to the original starting point and the ultimate destination of the specific trip being recorded. THIS IS IMPORTANT.

For trips beginning or ending at the sample dwelling unit the word "Home" may be entered to save time. For any other location within the internal study area BE SPECIFIC and enter the street address, the name of a store, building, or factory IF IT IS WELL KNOWN, or, if the location cannot be identified by either of the above two means, enter the nearest street intersection. A specific street address is desirable, but descriptions such as "North side of 2nd St. between Houston and ⬛⬛ ⬛n Streets" or "SW corner of 3d and Main Streets" are satisfactory. Just the ⬛⬛⬛⬛ f one street will not be acceptable because a street may pass through severa⬛ ⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛ subzones and, without some further designation than just the street name, it will be impossible for the coders to assign the beginning and ending of the trip to the proper subzones.

It is important to give the full name of the street by identifying it as an avenue, street, terrace, court, etc., in order to distinguish it from any others with a similar name. Care must also be taken to identify by the nearest street intersection, or address, stores such as A & P, Safeway, Western Auto, and others that have a number of branch stores all commonly known by the same name. In metropolitan areas composed of more than one city, the name or abbreviation of the city must be inc⬛⬛ded as an integral part of each origin and destination entry.

A person intending to go out of town may be taken to a bus or railroad station by automobile, or may take a streetcar, bus or taxi to the station. In these cases, the trip should be considered as ending at the station and the location of the station should be entered in column 6. A person's trip, when arriving by train from out-of-town points, would be recorded as beginning at the station. However, for automobile trips to or from points outside the internal study area, the name of the city or town to which the person went should be recorded. The street address in the "outside" city need not be recorded; the name of the city is sufficient. If the trip originates or is destined to a rural area, record a nearby village or the highway route number and approximate distance from the internal study area, i.e., 8 miles north on U.S. 81".

Land Use From-To: Land use refers to the type of activity from which and to which the travel occurred. Enter the appropriate number code in the columns. If there is any question concerning which land use category should be used, write the specific activity in the column for future coding by the supervisor.

Trip Purpose Code: Codes 01 through 12 are home based trip purposes, that is, either the origin or destination of the trip was at home. It will be found that about 4 out of 5 trips will fall in these categories. The remaining trips, those which have neither end at home, should be coded 13, NON-Home Based Trips.

The following is a brief discussion of the home based trip purpose codes.

01 Work: Trips between home and place of employment.

02 Related Business: This refers to trips between home and places other than place of employment but which are connected to the respondent's job. For example, a salesman traveling to a client directly from home.

03 Personal Business: Trips involving personal business transactions such as paying bills, or going to the bank.

04 Medical-Dental: Visits to doctors, hospitals, dentists, etc.

05 Eat Meal: Self-explanatory.

06 Education: School trips.

07 Civic-Religious: Trips to church, PTA meetings, or other community activities.

08 Shopping-Convenience Goods: Trips to purchase everyday necessities, food, drugs, cigarettes, household necessities.

09 Shopping-Shopping Goods: Trips to purchase major items, household appliances, furniture, clothes, shoes and other apparel.

Note: If in doubt as to type of shopping trip, note article being shopped for.

10 Social: Visits to friends' homes.

11 Recreational: Trips made to commercial or public recreational facilities, i.e., parks, beaches, bowling alleys, movies, concerts, etc.

Start at Home: To be filled in for Home Based Trips only (Purpose Codes 01 - 12).

Departure Code: Enter time of day, i.e., 7:15 A.M., 3:00 P.M.. Be sure to specify A.M. or P.M.. Enter appropriate day code.

Note: Same day should be specified for all trips of a given family.

Travel Mode Code: Enter appropriate Mode Code. If more than one mode is used in a single trip, code as follows:

Combinations	Code	
Bus and Transit - Auto Driver	Bus & Transit	3
Auto Driver - Auto Passenger	Auto Driver	1
Bus and Transit - Auto Pass.	Bus & Transit	3

No. in Car: Record for auto driver trips only (Mode Code 1). Enter total number of persons in car including driver.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bauer, Catherine. *Social Questions in Housing and Town Planning*. London: University of London Press, 1952.

Bernard, Jessie. *American Community Behavior*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1949.

Chapin, F. Stuart. *Urban Land Use Planning*. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1957.

Colean, Miles L. *Renewing Our Cities*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1953.

Festinger, Leon. *Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1953.

Hillman, Arthur. *Community Organization and Planning*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1950.

Webster, Donald H. *Urban Planning and Municipal Public Policy*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Articles and Periodicals

Adams, E. M. "The Logic of Planning," *Social Forces*, XXVIII (May, 1950), 419-23.

Dewey, Richard. "The Neighborhood, Urban Ecology, and City Planners," *American Sociological Review*, XV (August, 1950), 251-58.

Foley, Donald L. "The Daily Movement of Populations into the Central Business Districts," *American Sociological Review*, XVII (October, 1952), 538-43.

Kuper, Leo. "Social Science Research and the Planning of Urban Neighborhoods," *Social Forces*, XXIX (March, 1951), 237-43.

Loring, William C. "Housing Characteristics and Social Disorganization," *Social Problems*, (January, 1956), 508-16.

Riemer, Svend. "Social Planning and Social Organization," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII (May, 1947) 508-16.

Schnore, Leo F. "The Separation of Home and Work: A Problem for Human Ecology," *Social Forces*, XXXII (May, 1954) 336-43.

Reports

Bureau of Urban Research. *Urban Planning and Public Opinion: A Pilot Study*. Princeton: Princeton University, 1942.

Cook County, Illinois Housing Authority, *Scoring Community Desirability*. Chicago: February, 1949.

Kornhauser, Arthur. *Attitudes of Detroit People Toward Detroit: Summary of a Detailed Report*. Detroit: Wayne University, 1952.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF A COMMUNITY PLANNING
SURVEY FOR MANHATTAN, KANSAS

by

JAMES JOSEPH McGRAW

B. A., Oklahoma State Univ., 1955
M. A., Kansas State Univ., 1961

AN ABSTRACT OF
A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Department of Architecture and Allied Arts

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1963

This paper is the culmination of a research project which the writer began during the summer of 1961. Alan M. Voorhees, a city planning consultant located in Washington, D.C., employed me during this summer period to research and develop a community attitude survey expressly designed for use in the field of city and regional planning. When the project was completed and Mr. Voorhees had begun to satisfactorily utilize the survey device in his own consulting work, the author was granted permission to further investigate into the research potential of this survey instrument.

This thesis report is basically concerned with the rationale behind the development of the attitude survey; the actual design and development of the survey; the limits of use and value of the instrument; and the results obtained from the full scale survey conducted in Manhattan, Kansas.

This survey is not a statistical device created to measure a certain random quantity and then to extrapolate the results of this small measurement into a large general hypothesis. The survey is envisioned as a limited rating technique which the professional planner can utilize to obtain data concerning general community attitudes and preferences through a small random sample of the community's residents.

In the conclusion the author emphasizes the general nature of the survey, the major reason for its development and some of the potential dangers in the utilization of this type of survey device.